DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 226 234 CE 035 192

AUTHOR Bonnet, Deborah G.; Isherwood, Kimberley K.
TITLE Report to Congress on the Career Education Incentive Act (P.L. 95-207).
INSTITUTION Bonnet Phelps Associates, Indianapolis, IN.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (ED), Washington, DC. Div. of Career Education.
PUB DATE Sep 82
NOTE 90p.; For related documents see ED 194 771 and ED 208 223-224.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Annual Reports; *Career Education; *Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Legislation; *Financial Support; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Implementation; School Business Relationship; School Community Relationship; School Districts; State Programs
IDENTIFIERS Arizona; California; *Career Education Incentive Act 1977; Connecticut; Florida; Idaho; Pennsylvania; Texas; Virginia

ABSTRACT

In order to assess the effectiveness of the Career Education Incentive Act (CEIA) of 1977, data were collected from a review of eight states' fiscal 1980 and 1981 annual reports as well as from a study conducted by the American Institutes for Research. According to these data, CEIA monies have indeed been allotted and matched as prescribed by the act. Furthermore, the Division of Career Education, U.S. Department of Education has assumed a national leadership role in career education as well as an administrative one. The CEIA has also strengthened the role of state leadership in career education. In distributing local education agency (LEA) grants, some states have opted for intensity by concentrating resources in a small number of LEAs, while others have favored breadth by awarding large numbers of small grants. The CEIA has created widespread awareness of and involvement in career education not only within the elementary and secondary education community, but also among the business/labor/industry community. Finally, all the data reviewed indicated that the CEIA has strengthened states' capacities to promote career education on an ongoing basis. (Appended to the report are (1) a list of career education funds disbursed to each state in fiscal years 1979 through 1982 and (2) the text of the Career Education Incentive Act. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED226234

CE

REPORT TO CONGRESS

on the

CAREER EDUCATION INCENTIVE ACT

(P.L. 95-207)

by

Deborah G. Bonnet
Kimberley K. Isherwood
Bonnet Phelps Associates
Indianapolis, Indiana

for

The U.S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Division of Career Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

September 1982

CE035192

Bonnet Phelps Associates

REPORT TO CONGRESS
on the
CAREER EDUCATION INCENTIVE ACT
(P.L. 95-207)

Executive Summary

The Career Education Incentive Act (CEIA, P.L. 95-207) was enacted in 1977 to offer incentive grants to State and local education agencies (SEAs and LEAs) to develop and strengthen elementary and secondary career education programs. The purpose was to advance career education from its research and development phase, supported under P.L. 93-380, into national implementation.

The Act was designed as catalytic sunset legislation providing for decreasing levels of federal support from fiscal year 1979 through 1983, increasing State matching over the five year period, and substantial State discretion in allocating funds in accordance with States' own objectives as set forth in their State plans for career education.

A total of $54.6 million have been appropriated to the CEIA program. If distributed evenly among the nation's elementary and secondary schools, this would be equivalent to 34 cents per pupil in FY 1979, 26 cents in FY 1980, 18 cents in FY 1981, and 17 cents in FY 1982.

Forty-seven States, five insular areas, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have elected to participate in the State allotment program.

A review of eight States' FY 1980 and FY 1981 annual reports supplemented by a study conducted by the American Institutes for Research in 1980-81 forms the basis of the following conclusions:

CEIA monies have been allotted and matched as prescribed by the Act.

- 6.5 percent of the annual appropriation has been reserved at the federal level for model programs, information dissemination, and evaluation. The remaining 93.5 percent has been allotted to States and insular areas.
- The portion of State allotments passed on to LEAs has been more than the required 80 percent in FY 1979 and 85 percent thereafter. One estimate of the LEA pass-through is 84 percent; the other is over 90 percent. Both of these estimates deal primarily with FY 1979 funds.
- The States have spent more on leadership than on administration.
- State matching requirements have been met. As early as 1980 the average local match was estimated at 122 percent and the State match at an additional 124 percent. Local contributions were so large that even a total withdrawal of State funds would not jeapordize States' ability to comply with the 100 percent matching requirements that went into effect in FY 1981 for State administration and in FY 1982 for State leadership and LEA grants.

The Division of Career Education has assumed a national leadership role in career education as well as an administrative one, in accordance with the Congressional intent.

- The Division's major emphases have been (1) to promote collaboration with the business/labor/industry community and with civic and community organizations and (2) to encourage adoptions of and additions to the 28 career education programs already approved by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel.
- The Division of Career Education has maintained extensive communications with the career education community and collaborating organizations through career education monographs, speeches, memoranda, conferences, and technical assistance services.

The Career Education Incentive Act has strengthened the SEA role of State leadership in career education.

- CEIA funds have supported a variety of State efforts in training, collaboration, evaluation, and materials development and distribution.
- The promotion of educational equity in career education programming has been a strength in State leadership.
- Incorporating career education into teacher training institutions' ongoing preservice curricula is an area where relatively little success has been achieved and is sorely needed.

In distributing LEA grants, some States have opted for intensity by concentrating resources in a small number of LEAs while others have favored breadth by awarding large numbers of small grants.

- The number of LEAs served by the LEA portion of State allotments has varied from 2 percent to 100 percent.
- Some States have used the LEA portion to fund intermediate education agencies to provide training, technical assistance, and other support services to large numbers of LEAs. Other States have encouraged LEAs to form consortia, where CEIA resources are pooled and efforts are coordinated, but the governance of the CEIA grant is clearly in the hands of participating LEAs. In other States LEA grants have been made to single school districts. States have also combined these three types of grants in various ways.
- One philosophy concerning the size of LEA grants is to keep them small (usually in the $5,000 range) to prevent dependency on outside funding. Another is to make them large enough (usually $30,000 or more) to assure an impact. Which approach is more effective in promoting innovation on a Statewide basis has not been determined.
- All of the States reviewed promote a comprehensive approach to career education programming and most of them have funded all of the 13 LEA activities authorized by the Act. However, CEIA funds rarely support all 13 activities in a given LEA.

The CEIA has created a widespread awareness of and involvement ment in career education within the elementary and secondary education community.

- In most States the majority of LEAs have been reached through a combination of State leadership activities and LEA grants. In some States all LEAs have been served.
- All of the eight States estimate that a majority of schools have made significant progress toward comprehensive career education programming; in some States the estimate is over 90 percent.
- State Career Education Coordinators report that the CEIA program is one case where "seed grants" have clearly worked, with local efforts extending far beyond the levels and duration of grant awards.

The CEIA has created widespread awareness of and involvement in career education among the business/labor/industry community and civic and community organizations.

- Sixteen organizations have formulated national action plans for career education as a result of the Division of Career Education's leadership efforts. Forty-five States have in turn made plans to coordinate with these organizations.
- Eight States reported collaborative efforts with a total of 86 different agencies and organizations.

The CEIA has strengthened States' capacities to promote career education on an ongoing basis.

- In many States career education has been brought to the attention of the public in general and policymakers in particular through mechanisms such as legislative study committees, statewide assessment programs, and demonstrations of support from Governors and other senior officials.
- Career education has been established as State educational policy in some States through legislative actions and the inclusion of career education in State goals for education, accreditation standards, school improvement initiatives, and State-approved curricula and texts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

1. BACKGROUND 4

Summary of P.L. 95-207 4
Career Education Prior to P.L. 95-207 7
Funding of P.L. 95-207 10
State Participation in P.L. 95-207 12
Basis for this Report 13

2. FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION AND LEADERSHIP 17

Administration 17
National Leadership 19
National Advisory Council for Career Education 25

3. STATE OVERVIEWS 28

California 28
Texas 29
Pennsylvania 30
Florida 31
Virginia 32
Connecticut 33
Arizona 34
Idaho 35

4. STATES' USE OF CEIA ALLOTMENTS 36

States' Objectives 38
Employing SEA Personnel: Sec. 8(a)(1) 41
Reviewing and Revising State Plans: Sec. 8(a)(4) 41
State Leadership: Sec. 8(a)(2) 42
Disbursements to LEAs: Sec. 8(a)(2) 48
LEAs' Use of Funds: Sec. 8(a)(3) 53
Special Provisions of the Act 57

5. STATE IMPACT 61

6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 64

REFERENCES 68

APPENDICES

A. State Allotments
B. The Career Education Incentive Act

- Working with other State agencies and developing cadres of career education experts are among the other methods employed by SEAs to expand career education's advocacy base and to integrate career education throughout the education system and into employment, training, and human services programs.

In spite of its relatively small size and short duration, it appears that the Career Education Incentive Act has achieved its purpose of advancing the career education movement from the research and development stage well into nationwide implementation. Furthermore, the integration of career education into States' policies and programs gives reason to believe that the impact will endure.

The CEIA program's success in promoting career education at the local, State, and national levels demonstrates the feasibility of combining federal leadership and support for innovation with recognition that education is ultimately a State and local responsibility. Particular features of the Act which seem to have contributed to its impact include: wide discretion in SEAs' and LEAs' use of funds, minimum reporting requirements, declining federal support combined with increasing matching requirements, and provision for leadership at both the State and national levels.

Prepared for:
The U.S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and
Secondary Education
Division of Career Education

By:
Bonnet Phelps Associates
Indianapolis, Indiana

September 1982

INTRODUCTION

On December 13, 1977, Congress enacted the Career Education Incentive Act (CEIA, P.L. 95-207). The purpose was to assist in developing and strengthening career education programs by authorizing incentive grants to State and local education agencies (SEAs and LEAs). Career education has since been consolidated with 27 other federal programs of elementary and secondary education under Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation Improvement Act (Section 551, Subtitle D of P.L. 97-35, the Omnibus Reconciliation Act). Categorical funding of most of the 28 consolidated programs has been discontinued. However, the Congress extended P.L. 95-207 through fiscal year 1982. Pursuant to the Tydings Amendment, CEIA allotments will continue to be available to the States through September 30, 1983.

Following is a report of activities and accomplishments resulting from the Career Education Incentive Act. Chapter 1 provides an overview of the Act's key provisions and funding, the history of career education, and the data base for this report. Chapter 2 addresses administration and leadership on the federal level. Chapter 3 outlines the current status of career education in eight States, the uses they made of CEIA allotments, and the accomplishments they attribute to the program. Chapter 4 describes the States' objectives and activities with respect to

various sections of the Act. Chapter 5 lists strategies employed by the States to achieve lasting statewide impact of their efforts in career education. Major findings and final conclusions are presented in Chapter 6.

Exhibit 1

The Career Education Concept

Definition

The totality of experiences, which are designed to be free of bias and stereotyping . . . through which one learns about, and prepares to engage in, work as part of his or her way of living, and through which he or she relates work values to other life roles and choices (such as family life).

P.L. 95-207 Sec. 15(1)(A)

Goals for Educational Reform

(1) To change the education system through inserting a "careers" emphasis throughout the currriculum, K-12 and beyond.

(2) To increase community/education system linkages in ways that make career education a community effort rather than an effort of the education system alone.

(3) To provide persons with the employability/adaptability/promotability skills required to change with change in the occupational society:

- Basic academic skills
- Good work habits
- Personally meaningful work values
- Understanding and appreciation of the private enterprise system
- Self-understanding of career interests and aptitudes
- Understanding of educational/occupational opportunities
- Career decision-making skills
- Job seeking/finding/getting/holding skills
- Skills in making productive use of leisure time
- Skills in overcoming bias and stereotyping
- Skills in humanizing the workplace for oneself

Hoyt, 1980

Ch. 1

BACKGROUND

Summary of P.L. 95-207

In enacting the Career Education Incentive Act the Congress declared that:

> (1) a major purpose of education is to prepare every individual for a career suitable to that individual's preferences,
>
> (2) career education should be an integral part of the Nation's educational process which serves as preparation for work,
>
> (3) career education holds promise of improving the quality of education and opening career opportunities for all students by relating education to their life aspirations, and
>
> (4) educational agencies and institutions (including agen- higher education, adult education, employment training and retraining, and vocational education) should make every effort to fulfill that purpose. (P.L. 95-207, Sec. 2)

It was a fundamental premise of the Act that funding and direction of career education is ultimately a State and local responsibility. However, "there is a proper federal role for providing the initial funding for these activities, for coordinating the development of State and local planning, and for evaluating and disseminating the results obtained" (Senate Committee on Human Resources, Report on Career Education Incentive Act [S.1328], 1977, p.13).

P.L. 95-207 was therefore enacted as catalytic sunset legislation providing for:

- o Decreasing levels of federal support from FY 1980 through FY 1983 (after an increase in authorization from FY 1979 to FY 1980), with federal funding terminating at the end of the five-year period.
- o Increasing State matching over the five-year period.
- o Substantial State discretion and modest reporting requirements. States' participation in the CEIA program is optional. In formulating their State plans, States are free to select from a large but finite list of acceptable activities. Annual reports consist primarily of an accounting of expenditures and progress toward the objectives set forth in State plans. In contrast to some federal education programs, the Career Education Incentive Act does not require States to report numbers of students served, numbers of schools or teachers participating, or standardized measures of program impact (such as achievement test results).
- o A federal role of leadership and administration, limited by a 6.5 percent ceiling on the portion of the annual appropriation the Commissioner could reserve.

The Division of Career Education (then the Office of Career Education) was designated as the administering agency within the U.S. Department of Education (then the Office of Education). The Division's responsibilities include not only reviewing State plans, applications, and annual reports, but also providing technical assistance and orchestrating national leadership to promote further career education implementation.

Other activities of national scope authorized by the Act are making direct grants to model programs, disseminating career information and information about career education, conducting national evaluations, convening the National Advisory Council on Career Education, and arranging for postsecondary educational

demonstration projects. (The postsecondary program was never funded.)

The remainder of the annual appropriation (93.5 percent) is distributed to the States and insular areas in proportion to their populations aged five to eighteen (except that a minimum of $125,000 was placed on each State's allotment). State education agencies (SEAs) are permitted to use the funds to employ personnel, to review and revise the State plan, and to perform State leadership functions, either directly or through grants and contracts. Authorized leadership activities include inservice training; materials collection, dissemination, and evaluation; Statewide needs assessments and evaluations, and; collaboration with representatives of business, industry, labor, government, and other organizations who might contribute to or hold an interest in making career education a total community effort.

At least 85 percent of each State's allotment (80 percent in FY 1979) is to be granted to local education agencies (LEAs) making applications to the SEA. States were left considerable flexibility in establishing priorities and criteria for LEA grants. Similarly, the list of activities specified in P.L. 95-207 as fundable through local incentive grants encompasses virtually every reasonable cost of undertaking a major curricular innovation.

Career Education Prior to P.L. 95-207

While historical antecedents to career education extend back many years, the formal movement is generally considered to have begun in 1971.

A public call for educational reform spawned its inception. Serious concern about the nation's educational system was being voiced by a variety of groups, including parents, students, and the business/labor/industry community; many of the criticisms centered around the failure of education to relate to the world of work and to prepare citizens to assume a productive role in society.

Much of the early piloting and demonstration of career education was supported by the federal government through Parts C and D of the Vocational Education Act and the National Institute of Education. Section 406 of the 1974 Special Projects Act (P.L. 93-380) was the first specific career education legislation enacted by the Congress. Its major provisions were to:

(1) Establish an Office of Career Education in the U.S. Office of Education.

(2) Establish a National Advisory Council for Career Education.

(3) Call for a national assessment of the current status of career education.

(4) Authorize grants to develop and demonstrate effective methods and techniques of career education.

(5) Authorize grants to SEAs to develop state plans for career education.

The total appropriation for the four years of P.L. 93-380 beginning in FY 1975 and ending in FY 1978 was $40.4 million.

The national survey conducted in accordance with the Act during school year 1974-75 revealed that interest in and committment to career education extended well beyond the participants in specially-funded research and demonstration projects. Sixty percent (about 9,000) of the nation's school districts were estimated to have begun career education implementation efforts. Two-thirds of the states had formally endorsed career education as an educational policy and over half had appointed (and were supporting from state funds) full-time state coordinators of career education (McLaughlin, 1976).

Initially, the formulation of a specific federal definition of career education was avoided in favor of leaving local educators wide discretion in evolving their own responses to the call for educational reform. By 1975 there was reasonable national consensus concerning a set of assumptions and objectives that represented a rough operational definition of career education (U.S. Office of Education, 1975).

By 1977 it was clear that:

- o <u>There was substantial evidence that the learner outcome goals of career education were achievable</u> - and had been achieved - in a wide range of elementary and secondary settings.

  (Exhibit 1 lists the learner outcome goals. Reviews and syntheses of large numbers of evaluations include: Tuckman and Carducci, 1974; National Advisory Council for Career Education, 1976; Enderlein, 1976; Datta, Arterbury, Rapley, Spieth, Ruff, and High, 1976; Bhaerman, 1977; Herr, 1977; Bonnet, 1977)

- o The career education movement enjoyed widespread nationwide support among educators, students, parents, state legislators, and the business community.

  (Hoyt, 1975, 1976; Development Associates, 1975; Herr, 1975, 1977; McLaughlin, 1976; High, 1976; National Advisory Council for Career Education, 1976)

- o Sufficient knowledge, materials, and expertise had been developed to support an efficient national diffusion of the career education concept.

- o Many states and school districts lacked the resources for teacher training, materials acquisition, and other costs of implementing career education, and many others had been able to implement career education only partially, such as in a few schools or in a few grade levels.

These factors led to the enactment of the Career Education Incentive Act (P.L. 95-207). The main thrust was to enable the implementation of the state plans developed under P.L. 93-380, thereby moving career education beyond its research and development stage into its national implementation stage.

Funding of P.L. 95-207

Every year, appropriations have been smaller and allotted to the States later than expected.

Authorizations and appropriations for carrying out the elementary and secondary portion of the Act have been as follows:

Year	Authorized	Appropriated
FY 1979	$ 50 million	$20.0 million
FY 1980	$100 million	$15.0 million
FY 1981	$100 million	$10.0 million
FY 1982	$ 50 million	$ 9.6 million

The total elementary and secondary appropriation for the four years is $54.6 million, or 18.2 percent of the $300 million authorized for this period. No funds were ever appropriated for the postsecondary demonstration portion of the Act (Sec. 11), which was authorized at a level of $15 million per year.

Due to delays in the appropriation process followed by a Presidential recision, FY 1979 funds were not released to the Division of Career Education until May, 1979. It took an additional two months to allocate funds to the States, which meant that most grants from States to LEAs were made after the 1979-80 school year was well underway. This dimished the impact of the first year's funding and postponed the Act's potential for full impact at the local level until the 1980-81 school year. It also meant a two-year lag between the completion of State plans developed under P.L. 93-380 and support for their implementation under P.L. 95-207.

Similar patterns of delays in appropriations followed by recisions were repeated in the following years. The earliest

release of funds to the States was in FY 1982, when the process took place in May.

The Tydings Amendment (Section 412(b) of the General Education Provisions Act) allows the use of one year's appropriation through the end of the following fiscal year. Although funding delays have impeded planning and disrupted program continuity, they have not forced hasty expenditures.

Exhibit 2 shows each year's total appropriation (including the 6.5 percent reserved at the federal level) and the time period during which the State allotments have been available to the States.

Exhibit 2

Funding of P.L. 95-207

Calendar Year	78				79				80				81				82				83			
Fiscal Year/	78				79				80				81				82				83			
Quarter	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
P.L. 95-207 enacted	x																							
P.L. 93-380 expires				x																				
FY 79 funds ($20.0 mil) available to States									├	─	─	─	>>>>>>>											
FY 79 reports due											x													
FY 80 funds ($15.0 mil) available to States													├	─	─	─	>>>>>>>							
FY 80 reports due														x										
FY 81 funds ($10.0 mil) available to States																	├	─	─	─	>>>>>>>			
FY 81 reports due																		x						
FY 82 funds ($9.6 mil) available to States																					├	─	─	─

> Carryover allowed by the Tydings Amendment

State Participation in P.L. 95-207

Forty-seven States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have elected to participate in the CEIA program. Two additional States (Nevada and South Dakota) applied for and received FY 1979 allotments, but withdrew later in the year. New Mexico has never chosen to participate.

State allotments have been distributed in proportion to the States' populations aged five to eighteen (except that the minimum is $125,000 per year), as specified in the Act. The amounts are listed in Appendix A.

The same basis has been used for awarding grants to insular areas from the one percent of the annual appropriation reserved for this purpose. Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands have all participated each year, with the exception of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in FY 1980.

Basis for this Report

This report was prepared pursuant to Section 14(c) of P.L. 95-207, which states:

> The Commissioner shall conduct a comprehensive review of a random sample of the State programs funded under this Act and shall submit a report on such review to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Human Resources of the Senate by no later than September 30, 1982.

The sample of States. The Division of Career Education consulted with the National Center for Educational Statistics in selecting a sample of eight States in such a way that each represents approximately the same number of children aged five to eighteen (and thus approximately the same combined State allotment under P.L. 95-207). The States were placed in descending order of size and grouped into eight strata so that the total allotment in each stratum was approximately equivalent. One State was then selected to represent each stratum. California is one of only two States in the first stratum (the other is New York), but Idaho serves as the representative of fourteen low population States. The eight States are:

California	Virginia
Texas	Connecticut
Pennsylvania	Arizona
Florida	Idaho

The annual reports. These States' annual reports for fiscal years 1980 and 1981 serve as the principle data base for this report. Because funds were received late in each fiscal year, activities were generally carried out in subsequent fiscal years

and any given year's annual reports deal primarily with activities funded with the prior year's allotments. (This lag is clarified by Exhibit 2, page 11.) The FY 1980 and 1981 reports reviewed here deal mainly with FY 1979 and FY 1980 funds; approximately $30 million had been expended under P.L. 95-207 at the conclusion of FY 1981.

The annual reports submitted by the States contain a great deal of information regarding the uses made of the CEIA funds. However, wide variations among the States in both the types and specificity of the information provided make it difficult to aggregate, compare, or generalize from the data reported by various States. This problem is greatest at the intermediate and local levels, where variations in the form and content of States' reports of activities and accomplishments are especially incomparable.

Many of the problems inherent in States' annual reports as a data base for a report of national scope stem from the fact that the reports are organized, for the most part, around the States' objectives set forth in their State plans. It was the intent of the Congress that State plans be unique, and so they are - not only because States' circumstances and priorities differ, but also because of the timing of their development. State planning supported under P.L. 93-380 began two years before P.L. 95-207 was enacted and nearly four years before the first funds became available. Thus, the States' objectives were formulated without the guidance of the CEIA's conceptual framework, resulting in less correspondence between States' objectives and specific

provisions of the Act than one might otherwise expect. (However, compatability between objectives and allowable costs under the Act has been achieved through reviews by the Division of Career Education and a 1979 contract with the American Institutes for Research whereby technical assistance was provided to the States in refining their State plans.)

Furthermore, State plans were originally developed in the absence of any sort of estimate of the federal funding which would support their implementation. This largely precluded definitively quantative objectives; objectives in the form of "to train teachers in career education methods" are far more prevalent than ones like "to provide at least 10 hours of training to at least 40 percent of the State's teachers by 1981". Similarly, reports of the extent to which the objectives have been achieved tend to follow the first form more than the second.

What this all means is that the eight States' annual reports are useful for understanding the range of uses made of P.L. 95-207 funds and the types of accomplishments resulting from those activities, but only limited inferences can be made on a nationwide basis concerning the extent to which the States engaged in various efforts, achieved various results, or increased their implementation of career education as a result of the Career Education Incentive Act program.

Other sources. Several supplementary sources of data were available for use in this report. The most important is a report of findings from a rapid feedback evaluation of the Career Education Incentive Act program concluded by the American

Institutes for Research (AIR) in June 1981. This study entailed analyses of the FY 1980 annual reports of 25 States and one insular area as well as visits to 9 SEAs, 7 IEAs, and 24 LEAs. One of the nine States also appears in the present sample (Pennsylvania). The Division of Career Education's annual reports of activities supported under P.L. 95-207, telephone interviews with the State coordinators of the eight States listed above, and data supplied by the Division of Career Education concerning its own activities are the other major data sources upon which this report is based.

Ch. 2

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION AND LEADERSHIP

The Career Education Incentive Act charges the Division of Career Education with administering the State allotment and discretionary programs authorized by the Act, providing technical assistance to the States, and assuming national leadership for career education. The intended federal role envisioned in the Act was clearly one of support and facilitation, rather than regulation. The CEIA identified two major functions for the Division of Career Education: administration of the program, including the provision of technical assistance to participants, and national leadership.

Exhibit 3 shows funds obligated each year under each section of the Act.

Administration

The administration of the Career Education Incentive Act program includes allocating funds to the States and insular areas, reviewing State plans, evaluating annual reports, providing detailed recommendations to States concerning their annual

Exhibit 3

P.L. 95-207
Appropriations and Allocations

	FY 1979	FY 1980	FY 1981	FY 1982
Appropriation	$20,000,000	$15,000,000	$10,000,000	$ 9,600,000
State allotments Sec. 5(a)(1)	18,500,000	13,875,000	9,250,000	8,880,000
Insular areas Sec. 5(a)(2)(D)	200,000	150,000	100,000	96,000
Model programs Sec. 5(a)(2)(A)	*1,000,000	750,000	500,000	480,000
CE information Sec. 5(a)(2)(B)	200,000	150,000	100,000	96,000
Evaluation Sec. 5(a)(2)(C)	100,000	75,000	50,000	48,000

* $500,000 reprogrammed

reports, and providing technical assistance through conferences and other means aimed at helping States better meet the requirements of the Act. Feedback provided by the Division of Career Education on state plans and annual reports has resulted in refinements of all of the States' plans, mostly to comply with Section 7 of the Act, which calls for measurable objectives and specifications of policies and procedures.

National Leadership

The Division of Career Education has performed its national leadership function by making speeches, issuing informational memoranda to the career education community, and publishing monographs on career education, as well as through discretionary grants and contracts.

Fifty-seven monographs on career education have been printed and disseminated by the Division of Career Education. Topics include summaries of career education evaluation findings, career education and adult education, independent business, labor, staff development, and reducing sex-role stereotyping. Some of these monographs have been translated into Spanish; all have been placed in the ERIC system and are also available from the Government Printing Office.

Exhibit 4 summarizes the discretionary programs carried out pursuant to sections 10, 12, and 5(2)(C) of the Act. They represent two major emphases of the Division of Career Education.

Collaboration. The first emphasis is the promotion of collaborative relationships with community organizations. Under contract, the Division of Career Education has conducted approximately 65 small group consensus conferences during the period of this legislation, each aimed at involving various specific portions of the population in refining and implementing the career education concept.

Approximately two-thirds of these were conducted with a combination of representatives from national community

Exhibit 4

Discretionary Grants and Contracts
P.L. 95-207

FY 1979

Recipient: InterAmerica Research Associates
Amount: $496,368
Authority: Section 10

Conducted a series of mini-conferences, four regional conferences, and a national conference on the relationships of community-based organizations to career education.

Recipient: National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC)
Amount: $83,000
Authority: Section 12(a)

Printed 6200 copies of NOICC-Related Activities: A Review of Federal Programs for distribution to the career education community.

Recipient: Capla Associates, Inc.
Amount: $16,250
Authority: Section 12(b)

Supplemented an existing contract with the National Diffusion Network to provide technical assistance to states for the dissemination of information about 12 exemplary career education programs in the National Diffusion Network.

Recipient: American Institutes for Research
Amount: $100,000
Authority: Section 5(a)(2)(C)

Funds transferred to the Office of Evaluation and Dissemination and combined with other funds to contract for the conduct of an evaluability assessment of the CEIA program.

Exhibit 4, cont.

FY 1980

Recipient: InterAmerica Research Associates
Amount: $211,789
Authority: Section 10

Conducted a series of mini-conferences with representatives from community-based organizations whose primary focus is on minority concerns.

Recipient: National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee
Amount: $69,999
Authority: Section 12(a)

Printed 21,500 copies of A Counselor's Guide to Occupational Information: A Catalog of Federal Career Publications for distribution within the career education community.

Recipient: Capla Associates, Inc.
Amount: $38,740
Authority: Section 12(b)

Supplemented an existing contract with the National Diffusion Network to disseminate information about exemplary career education programs in the NDN.

Recipient: American Institutes for Research
Amount: $75,000
Authority: Section 5(a)(2)(C)

Funds transferred to the Office of Evaluation and Dissemination and combined with other funds to contract for a rapid feedback evaluation of the CEIA program.

Exhibit 4, cont.

FY 1981

Recipient: American Institutes for Research
Amount: $144,841

Recipient: School Board of Pinellas County (Florida)
Amount: $141,543

Recipient: Upper Arlington (Ohio) Board of Education
Amount: $149,502

Authority: Section 10

Phase I of three elementary/secondary demonstration projects designed to evaluate student attainment of 9 learner outcomes in settings where 54 career education treatment elements are in place. (See Hoyt, 1977)

Recipient: New York State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee
Amount: $100,000
Authority: Section 12(a)

Funds transferred to the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee and used for a grant to facilitate and enhance the use of the U.S. Department of Labor's Occupational Outlook Handbook.

FY 1982

Recipient: American Institutes for Research
Amount: $107,002

Recipient: School Board of Pinellas County (Florida)
Amount: $103,227

Recipient: Upper Arlington (Ohio) Board of Education
Amount: $100,744
Authority: Section 10

Phase II of three projects described above.

organizations and State Career Education Coordinators. The culminating event of this series of small group conferences was a large national conference involving State Career Education Coordinators from 47 States and representatives of 16 national community organizations: AFL-CIO, National Institute for Work and Learning, National Alliance of Business, Association or Junior Leagues, 4-H, National Association for Industry-Education Cooperation, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Women's American ORT, American Legion/Auxiliary, Girls Scouts of the USA, Junior Achievement, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, Rotary International, National School Volunteers Program, National Retired Teachers Association/American Association of Retired Persons, and National Center for Service Learning.

This effort resulted in national action plans for career education on the part of all 16 organizations. Forty-five States also developed action plans for involving these organizations in their States' career education efforts. Some indication of the collaborative activity which was stimulated is found in the fact that during the five-month period from February 1 to June 30, 1981, the State Coordinators of Career Education reported making 650 contacts with community organizations. During the same time period, community organizations reported making 396 contacts with State Career Education Coordinators. In addition, 469 mutual contacts were established between the two groups. Further, during FY 1981, 17 States conducted State conferences on the topic of community partnerships for career education.

A second type of National consensus conference was conducted late in this legislative period involving representatives from a wide variety of national community organizations representing one of the four following types of minority persons: (1) Black Americans; (2) Hispanic Americans; (3) Native American Indians; and (4) Asian Pacific Americans. The funding for this legislation expired prior to the time when representatives from all of these kinds of organizations could be pulled together in a comprehensive national consensus building program with the State Career Education Coordinators.

A third type of national consensus conference was held with a combination of State Career Education Coordinators and representatives from CETA programs operating at the State and local levels. This effort culminated in a series of regional conferences involving State and local persons from both formal education and from CETA organizations.

National Diffusion Network. The second emphasis of the Division of Career Education is to work through the National Diffusion Network to disseminate successful career education programs. The three model programs currently underway are intended in part as final, definitive tests of the effects on students of fully implemented, comprehensive career education programs. The other aim is to add three more career education programs to the 28 already approved by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP). The Division of Career Education's plans for the balance of 1982 include further efforts to locate potential

submissions to the JDRP and to promote adoptions/adaptions of JDRP-approved career education programs.

Cooperative arrangements with the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee have served to "furnish information to interested parties on Federal programs which gather, analyze, and disseminate occupational and career information" as authorized in Section 12(a). The two-phase evaluation contract with American Institutes for Research, conducted in cooperation with the Office of Evaluation and Dissemination, has served to clarify and refine the goals and objectives of the Incentive Act program, as well as produce many of the findings presented in this report.

The National Advisory Council for Career Education

The National Advisory Council for Career Education (NACCE) was established under Section 406(g) of Title IV of the Education Amendments of 1974 (P.L. 93-380). The Council was extended under P.L. 95-207, and is charged with responsibility for advising the Secretary of Education and the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education on the implementation of career education legislation. The Council is also responsible for carrying out such other advisory functions as it deems appropriate, including reviewing the operation of programs in the Department of Education pertaining to the development and implementation of career education, evaluating their effectiveness in meeting the

needs of career education throughout the United States, and determining the need for further legislative remedy in order that all citizens may benefit from the purpose of career education.

The Council is comprised of nine nonvoting ex-officio members and 15 public members. The public members are to be broadly representative of the fields of education, guidance and counseling, the arts, the humanities, the sciences, community services, business and industry, and the general public.

The members are appointed by the Secretary of Education and the Chairperson is selected from among the public members. The members serve for terms of three years. The Deputy Director of the Division of Career Education serves as the Education Department's Delegate to the Council.

The first meeting of the Council was held on March 31 - April 1, 1975 under the Chairmanship of Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr. The purpose of this first meeting was to plan and schedule the Council's activities for the future, as the Council moved through its organizational phase. Four subsequent meetings were held in 1975.

The Council's Subcommittee on Survey and Assessment was involved in the designing and monitoring process of a contract issued to the American Institute of Research to conduct a national survey and assessment of career education. The report (McLaughlin, 1976) was transmitted to Congress on May 27, 1976. In addition to this report, the Council commissioned a total of fourteen papers and studies on issues relating to career education.

In 1976 the Council met six times. The topics of discussion included career education legislation, the Commissioner's National Conference, the survey and assessment report, commissioned papers, and the Council's objectives and future activities.

The Council held six meetings in 1977. They discussed career education legislation, priorities of the Council, and recent activities and future directions of the Council.

Three Council meetings were held in 1978. These meetings dealt with the implementation of P.L. 95-207, adequate funding, and policy issues affecting future implementation of career education.

The NACCE renewed activity in 1980 (following an inactive year in 1979 due to a lack of quorum) and met five times. The following topics were discussed: career education for adults, career education at the postsecondary level, and teacher training. The Council heard speakers from various institutions and community organizations endorse career education.

The Council did not meet in 1981 and the final meeting of the Council was held April 19-21, 1982. At this meeting the main topic of discussion was career education under the Block Grant Program.

The 1982 report of the Council was submitted to the Secretary of Education in August, 1982, for transmittal to the Congress. Detailed reports of the Council's meetings are available from the Division of Career Education.

Ch. 3

STATE OVERVIEWS

This chapter summarizes for each of the eight States included in this review the current status of career education, uses made of the CEIA allotments, and the resulting accomplishments. These data are based principally on telephone interviews with State Coordinators of Career Education. More detailed findings of the review of annual reports are presented in Chapters 4 and 5, by topic rather than by State.

California

California has combined CEIA funds with other State and federal resources to support a wide variety of leadership activities, including a 1981 national conference on career education. Grants to LEAs have been numerous and small to prevent dependency on outside funding. Hiring of local career education staff has been discouraged in favor of more permanent (i.e., locally-assumable) measures to integrate career education into ongoing academic and guidance curricula. Larger grants have been reserved for IEAs to develop curriculum, distribute materials, sponsor regional conferences, and conduct other activities designed to serve large numbers of LEAs.

The State Coordinator describes the career education movement as "still very much alive" in California, with many LEAs continuing their programs on local funds. Bringing career education to the attention of local decision-makers, convincing them of the need to infuse career education into the curriculum, and developing materials for local use, are among the State's accomplishments credited to the CEIA program.

No State legislation deals exclusively with career education. However, career education is encouraged or required by several special State programs in education, most notably the School Improvement Program, which requires that career education be included in school improvement plans. About 90 percent of California's elementary schools and 20 percent of its high schools have participated in this assessment and planning program to date.

Texas

A 1979 needs assessment estimated that 52 percent of Texas schools had comprehensive career education programs addressing all five elements of the State's implementation model (student needs assessment, staff development, career guidance, community resources, and local plans). The extent of involvement is believed to have increased substantially since that time. Career education is infused into all subjects and all grades of the State-adopted curriculum, as well as many of the State-approved texts.

Two attempts to obtain State funding for career education failed in the Senate after passing in the House. State leadership for career education has instead been assumed largely by business and industry, most notably by the Governor's Council on Career Education, composed of several of the State's leading industrialists. The Council is currently organizing and supporting career education alliances in ten communities. In addition, at least seven of the major Chambers of Commerce have hired full-time educational specialists who coordinate school and community efforts in career education. These and other cases of collaboration between the educational and business communities are attributable in part to a 1981 Governor's Symposium on Career Education, made possible by the Career Education Incentive Act program.

P.L. 95-207 funds have been granted to 19 of the State's 20 IEAs to provide training, technical assistance, and materials to LEAs. LEAs have been encouraged to form cooperatives to apply for direct grants, resulting in the participation of 229 of the State's 1102 districts in 42 CEIA projects to implement one or more of the State's five elements of career education.

Pennsylvania

Local autonomy in educational matters predominates in Pennsylvania; the SEA's role is characterized more by service than by authority. Neither the legislature nor the State board of education has acted on career education. However, the State's School Improvement Initiative, through which every district is reassessing its programs over a period of five years, has led a number of districts to identify career education as a priority. Most of the concepts of career education are encompassed by the State Board of Education-approved Goals of Quality Education, which form the basis of the School Improvement Initiative and other statewide educational activities.

Due to the SEA's limited authority to collect data from LEAs, no reliable estimates are available for the extent of LEA implementation of career education statewide, although the State Coordinator expects most of the LEAs which have received CEIA funding for two or more years to maintain their efforts on local funds (75-100 LEAs of 504 in the State).

LEA grants under the CEIA program have been made on an open competitive basis. About half of the participating districts have received direct grants for program implementation; a number of these programs now serve as models for other LEAs in the State. The remaining LEA recipients have formed consortia, with IEAs serving as consortium leaders governed by the participating LEAs. This arrangement has enabled bulk purchasing, joint training, and other cost-effective measures while preserving local control and involvement in the career education effort.

Florida

The State of Florida appropriates approximately $20 million per year to the Student Development Services Fund, which LEAs may use for career education, elementary counselors, and/or occupational specialists (career counselors). Last year $1.3 million went to career education specifically, but the other two uses of this fund also contribute to the career education effort. The State recently committed to permanent funding of the full-time State Coordinator's position. The State Advisory Council for Career Education sponsors a career shadowing program for all high school juniors and progress is underway toward establishing an emminent scholar chair for career education in one of the State's universities. Florida is now engaged in developing its next five-year plan for career education, for 1984-1989.

Sponsorship of national career education conferences is among the State leadership activities supported in part by P.L.95-207; the most recent was held in April 1982. The University of West Florida has served as the fiscal agent for State administration and leadership for the CEIA program. Florida's philosophy in the distribution of the LEA portion has been to award a grant to every LEA that applies; 41 of the 67 districts have done so.

The State Coordinator attributes CEIA with providing the means to maintain momentum and enhance enthusiasm for career education throughout the State. All 67 counties are involved in the movement to some degree, and participation continues to grow.

Virginia

From 1979 through 1981, the Virginia General Assembly committed $275,000 per year for LEA grants to implement career education. Even though that funding has been discontinued, several recent breakthroughs have left the State Coordinator optimistic about career education's future in Virginia.

Legislative actions have included the addition of elementary and secondary career education to the State's Standards of Quality (a set of mandated curriculum standards) and the formation of a legislative study committee on vocational, technical, and career education. The State Board of Education has expressed interest in the movement by approving a definition for career education and giving career education first priority in their Focus on Instruction, a program whereby local educators present successful programs to the Board. The State Advisory Committee for Career Education, representing 23 agencies and organizations, has become very active in promoting career education across the State.

CEIA grants to LEAs have been intended as seed money; $5,000 planning grants and $20,000 implementation and continuation grants have been awarded on a competitive basis. In response to the reduction in funding, this year's grants will be for special emphases (e.g., infusion, collaboration) rather than comprehensive programming as in prior years. Special priority will also be given to districts that have not participated in this or other career education grant programs in the past.

The State Coordinator believes that the CEIA program has been a strong impetus to initiating career education in the participating districts and is pleased with districts' continuation of their efforts after outside funding has expired. He estimates that about half of the State's 141 districts have made substantial progress toward comprehensive career education programming.

Connecticut

A 1980 Connecticut general statute requires that every school district have a "planned, systematic, and ongoing program of career education, K-12". Enforcement begins this year.

Adult Basic Education programs also must include career education components to receive State funds and career education is included in the Connecticut Assessment of Educational Progress program (patterned after the National Assessment of Educational Progress). Connecticut students scored 10-15 percentage points above national averages in last year's administration. Ongoing statewide planning and evaluation is assured by biannual submissions of a Master Plan for Career and Vocational Education to the Connecticut General Assembly.

Each school district has a philosophy statement on career education, a local action plan, and a designated career education coordinator (generally a part-time responsibility). These accomplishments are the result of a State appropriation of $1.5 million for school years 1978-79 and 1979-80 (combined), intended from the start as sunset legislation.

The State has also made good progress in installing preservice training in career education methods in its colleges and universities.

The State Coordinator credits P.L. 95-207 with providing the impetus for Connecticut's committment to career education, as well as the means for supporting the installation of LEAs' career education plans. Over 95 percent of the CEIA grant has been used to fund six IEAs to provide staff development, technical assistance, and materials to all LEAs.

Arizona

The State Legislature committed nearly $2 million to career education in 1971, making Arizona the first State to launch a statewide initiative in the emerging movement. From then through 1981, State funding varying from $2 to $4 million annually supported a variety of State leadership activities and provided incentives for the formation of county-wide consortia (IEAs) to establish and support career career education programs. As a result, virtually every school in the State has participated in the career education effort and the last annual report to the legislature estimated that 60-70 percent of the State's teachers were incorporating career education into their instruction.

Over 98 percent of Arizona's CEIA allotment was passed on to LEAs on a competitive grant basis; seven programs were funded in FY 1980 and five in FY 1981.

After ten years of strong State leadership, the legislature considers it time for the responsibility for career education to be fully assumed at the local level. State funding of career education is now limited to a provision in the school finance formula for $7 per student in grades 6-8 intended for career education. The State Coordinator reports that although career education has been thoroughly diffused throughout the State, the movement has plateaued and may decline as a result of staff turnover with little preservice training or continued inservice training to counteract its effects.

Idaho

The Idaho State Legislature has never acted upon career education. However, the State Board of Education has included career education in the Standards and Recommendations for Elementary Schools and a blue-ribbon Commission on Excellence recently concluded with strong recommendations to the State Legislature and Board of Education in support of K-12 career education infusion.

A portion of Idaho's CEIA grant has been reserved for "mini-grants", limited to $300 each, made directly to individual teachers with their superintendents' approval. This has resulted in some highly creative projects which have generated enthusiasm for career education far beyond the classrooms that have participated. LEA grants have also supported the implementation of the Idaho Career Information System and a number of adoptions of career education programs of proven effectiveness, including several JDRP-approved models. The State's plans for the coming year include a focus on incorporating career education into teacher training curricula of colleges and universities.

Although Idaho's allotment has been only $125,000 each year, the State Coordinator reports that career education in the State has "come a long way" as a result of offering schools the start-up money for career education. Even in districts that have not received LEA grants, she sees notable progress toward incorporating career education, particularly in elementary and vocational programs.

Ch. 4

STATES' USE OF CEIA ALLOTMENTS

The States have used their allotments as the Congress intended.

Exhibit 6 summarizes distributions of expenditures for State administration, State leadership, and LEA grants. The analysis of FY 1980 reports from 25 States and one insular area conducted by the American Institutes for Research (AIR, 1981) showed that 84 percent of the SEAs' grants were passed on to LEAs. The sample of eight States used here reported an average of over 90 percent LEA pass-through in FY 1980 and 1981 combined. The Act required that a minimum of 80 percent go to LEAs in FY 1979 and 85 percent in each year thereafter. Since FY 1980 reports deal primarily with FY 1979 funds, then, the Congressional intent has been exceeded substan- tially, with most States reserving less at the State level than allowed by the Act.

Furthermore, over half of the SEA expenditures have been for State leadership rather than administration, which was also the intent of Congress. (Ten percent was allowed for leadership each year. For administration, ten percent was allowed in FY 1979 and five percent in each year thereafter.)

The remainder of this chapter examines the States' objectives and activities more closely, then addresses States' compliance with several special provisions of the Act.

Exhibit 5

State Allotments
P.L. 95-207

ST	FY 79	FY 80	FY 81	FY 82	TOTAL
CA	$1,682,038	$1,237,232	$ 738,282	$ 693,855	$4,351,307
TX	1,058,241	784,244	468,013	462,745	2,773,243
PA	906,038	654,224	390,420	351,812	2,302,494
FL	599,028	443,912	264,913	264,538	1,573,391
VA	408,695	299,822	178,925	164,888	1,052,330
CT	245,412	176,836	126,584	125,000	673,832
AZ	189,030	141,179	126,264	125,000	581,473
ID	125,513	128,472	125,482	125,000	504,467

Exhibit 6
States' Use of Allotments

(As percentages of total outlays in FY 1980 and FY 1981 combined)

	CA	TX	PA	FL	VA	CT	AZ	ID	Avg.	AIR
Total SEA	12.0	7.3	14.3	19.0	12.1	4.7	1.5	7.0	9.7	16
Administration										
Personnel 8(a)(1)	9.1	2.9	4.5	8.1	4.0	.7	.8	.7	3.9	6.0
State planning 8(a)(4)	.3	-	-	.3	-	-	-	.4	.1	.5
Total	9.4	2.9	4.5	8.4	4.0	.7	.8	1.1	4.0	6.5
State Leadership 8(a)(2)										
Training & TA	-	2.2	5.3	6.4	.4	.6	-	2.5	2.2	3
Needs/eval.	-	.2	-	1.4	-	-	-	.3	.2	1
CE materials	.1	.5	2.6	.7	1.4	.1	-	1.2	.8	2
Other	2.4	1.4	1.8	2.0	6.3	3.3	.7	2.8	2.6	3
Total	2.5	4.4	9.8	10.6	8.1	4.0	.7	5.9	5.7	9
Total LEA	88.0	92.7	85.7	81.0	87.9	95.3	98.5	93.0	90.3	84

AIR's data based on 26 FY 80 annual reports
Totals may not add up due to rounding

States' Objectives

It would have been reasonable for the States to set objectives concerning any or all of the following:

(1) What the SEA would do to promote career education.

(2) What others would do to promote career education on a statewide basis.

(3) What LEAs and communities would do to instill career education into local educational practices.

(4) What students would experience with regard to career education.

(5) What benefits students would derive from those experiences.

However, the majority of objectives contained in State plans are of the first type. Relatively few of the second and third types were found, and none of the fourth or fifth.

States' objectives consist largely of work plans for the State career education staff and, to a lesser extent, for their Advisory Councils and grantees. Most of the objectives are on the modest side (though by no means trivial) and under the direct control of the SEA. Even though most of the CEIA funds go to the local level, most of the State plan objectives focus on the State level. Consequently, States' annual reports are primarily concerned with State level activities.

Only four of the eight States have objectives addressing local-level accomplishments and only one of them has specified target numbers of LEAs that will achieve them. Nevertheless, the intended effects of State-level activities are easily

discernible - that is, objectives of types 2-5 above are clearly implied if not announced as accountability standards. ("To encourage cooperative planning among [various groups] to integrate career education goals into all instructional and guidance programs" is a typical example.)

As shown in Exhibit 7, six of the eight States included in this review specify objectives for State administration and all eight have objectives for State leadership. Training and technical assistance is the most common leadership objective (100%); efforts to incorporate career education into teacher training institutions is the least (50%). AIR's analysis shows similar patterns and also includes estimates of the proportion of objectives which had been achieved. The rates are quite high, particularly for objectives concerning State administration (93%), career education materials (93%), and collaboration (93%). Only statewide needs assessment or evaluation objectives were achieved in less than 85 percent of the cases.

A comparison of Exhibit 6 to Exhibit 7 demonstrates that States occasionally expended funds in categories where they stated no State plan objectives, and vice versa. Thus, the following sections, corresponding with provisions of the Act specifying allowable costs, deal more with States' activities and expenditures than with their objectives per se.

Exhibit 7

States' Objectives and Achievment

	% States with objectives		Avg. % objectives achieved
	Present study N=8	Air study N=26	(AIR study)
SEA administration	75%	69%	93%
Employing pers.	25%	23%	92%
Review/revise SP	38	46	91
Other		62	96
State leadership	100%	92%	86%
Training & TA	100	88	89
Needs/evaluation	63	62	69
CE materials	75	81	83
Collaboration	88	54	93
Preservice	50	na	na
Other	38	65	86
LEA accomplishment	50%	77%	94%

Note: AIR's categorization scheme is not described in detail and may differ from that used here, particularly at the local level.

Employing SEA personnel: Sec. 8(a)(1) of P.L. 95-207

The three smallest States' expenditures in this category were negligible, accounting for less than one percent of their allotments (see Exhibit 6). In the other five States it ranged from 4.0 to 9.4 percent, or from less than one full time equivalent to 2.5.

As of August, 1982 five of the eight SEAs still had at least one person assigned to career education full time. In two States these positions were supported entirely from State funds, whereas Career Education Incentive Act funds continued to support a portion of the others' salaries. Section 9(c)(1) limits that portion to 50 percent beginning in FY 1981.

State Coordinators and their staffs typically perform a variety of State leadership and planning functions, as well as administer State and local CEIA grants.

Reviewing and Revising the State Plan: Sec. 8(a)(4)

Only three States reported State plan review or revision as an objective; in all cases it was achieved. One of the three States is currently developing its five-year plan for 1984-88.

State Leadership: Sec. 8(a)(2)

By authorizing a variety of leadership activities to promote career education on a statewide basis, the Act encourages States to extend the CEIA program's impact beyond the LEAs receiving direct grants. AIR found that all of the nine States they visited took advantage of the opportunity; the same is true for all eight States studied here. One of them limited its CEIA-supported leadership activities to the development of videotapes for use in preservice training. The other seven engaged in a variety of activities designed to create interest in career education and to expand capacities to implement it.

Leadership activities fall into four categories: training and technical assistance (authorized by paragraphs a, b, and e of Section 8(a)(2), statewide needs assessments and evaluations (d), career education materials (c), collaboration (f), and incorporation into teacher training institutions (g).

Training and technical assistance took the forms of conferences, workshops, and consulting on the State, regional, and local levels. These activities varied from an hour or less to a week or more and involved from a few individuals to over 600. Rather than choose between the approaches of training local representatives who would in turn conduct local training, or to provide direct services to the local level, most States seem to have done both. Teachers and counselors are the most common participants in training activities, but a number of efforts are directed to school boards, superintendents, parents, and the

business/labor/industry community. SEA staff and local career education practitioners are normally the presenters; some States have made concerted efforts to develop cadres of local personnel able to lend assistance to other LEAs. Popular topics include career education infusion, curriculum development, community partnerships, eliminating sex stereotyping, and proposal development.

Needs assessments and evaluations. In their review of 26 annual reports, AIR found that States' objectives in the statewide needs assessment and evaluation category were the least likely to be attained (69%). Evaluation plans appear to be among the first disbanded when funding levels are less than expected. Of the eight States reviewed here, three reported no evaluations or needs assessments in FY 1980 or 1981. Two States conducted needs assessments - one to determine inservice training needs and another to poll public opinions concerning the need for career education. Two States measured students' career development achievement, one of them through an ongoing statewide assessment program that now includes a career and occupational development component. Only one State attempted to measure statewide LEA implementation of career education within the time frame of this review.

Still in use for planning and promotional purposes are data from needs assessments conducted in conjunction with the State planning that took place in the late 1970s. It is also common practice to require evaluation components in LEA programs funded under CEIA. Two of the nine States visited by AIR and one of the

eight reviewed here emphasize the identification of effective, transportable programs as a major purpose of LEA evaluations.

Career education materials. Seven of the eight States reported statewide materials dissemination activities. Three established career education resource centers offering collections of materials for LEAs' use on a continuous basis; in one case a single center serves the entire State and in two others IEAs perform this function. In one additional case CEIA funds provide partial funding of the State's guidance service center. Selected materials are also distributed by direct mail (often to every LEA in the State), through conferences and workshops, and by request to the SEA. State professional journals, newsletters, and career education networks are also used as mechanisms of statewide communication.

All eight States have developed career education materials (of other than an administrative nature) as well as collected, evaluated, and disseminated them. They include slide/tape presentations, videotapes, computer information systems, and printed materials, mainly of a "how to" nature. Topics include how to eliminate bias and stereotyping, how to form community partnerships, how to institute a K-12 program, how to use community resouces, develop an infusion curriculum, represent your program to the community, secure funding, locate instructional materials, and learn from the experiences of others. At least two States compiled teacher-developed materials and at least one produced informational pamphlets targeted to State legislators and other policy makers. One State placed

priority on collaborating with the State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee.

Collaboration. All but one of the eight States reported State-level efforts to collaborate with other public entities and with business, labor, industry, professional, civic, and community organizations. The results of collaboration include:

- Broad-based input into career education plans, policies, and practices.
- Joint programming and resource sharing.
- Student exposure to the world of work and career opportunities through field trips, exploratory work experiences, guest speakers, and the like.
- Heightened awareness among educators of career opportunities and the needs and concerns of co-collaborators (particularly the private sector), often through experiences similar to those provided to students.
- The integration of career education concepts into educational programs operated both within and apart from the formal educational system.
- Donations of materials, facilities, time, and money to the career education effort.
- Advocacy and visibility for career education.

Each of these outcomes was reported by the seven States, though the extent to which have been realized is difficult to quantify, either on the basis of annual reports or, as AIR discovered, from visits to the States. However, the list of organizations and agencies engaged in State-level collaboration with career education representatives in the seven States alone is impressive. See Exhibit 8.

Exhibit 8

Community Collaboration

Collaboration with the following groups was reported by at least one of the eight States.

Business, Industry, Labor

State Chambers of Commerce
Industry Education Councils
National Alliance of Businessmen
Americans for Competitive Enterprise System
Association of Engineers
National Federation of Independent Businessmen
Home Builders Association
Farm Bureau
Medical associations
Public Accountants
Personnel associations
Hospitals
Bankers associtions
Bar associations
Boards of realtors
Dental societies
Newspapers
Television stations
Art museums
Manufacturers associations
State Labor Councils
AFL-CIO
Local unions

Youth and Service Organizations

Rotary	Kiwanas
Girl Scouts	Boy Scouts
4-H	YMCA
Lions	Shriners
Big Brothers	Big Sisters
Jaycees	Junior League
Sertoma Club	Urban League

American Legion
American Legion Auxiliary
Junior Achievement
Sertoma Club
Heart Association
Catholic Social Services
Ministerial Association
American Women's ORT

Public Agencies

Armed Forces	CETA
City Councils	Mayors
SOICCs	FBI

U.S. Postal Service
U.S. Department of Labor
Vocational Rehabilitation
Office of the Governor
Employment Security
Affirmative Action
County Extension Agencies
Health Departments
Mental Health Centrs
Game & Fish Reserves
Departments of Transportation
County Commissioners
Law enforcement agencies

Educational Agencies & Organizations

Private schools
National Diffusion Network
Instructional TV Council
Council for Exceptional Children
National Academy for Voc. Ed.
National Art Education Assoc.
PTA
American Council for Teachers of Foreign Languages
Vocational education
State offices of migrant education
Universities
State textbook committees
National School Volunteers
Retired Public School Employees
School Administrators Association
Community Education Work Councils
School Enrichment Resource Volunteers
Volunteer Services Bureau
American Assoc. of Univ. Women
Citizens advisory committees
Council on Economic Education
American Personnel and Guidance Association

Promoting preservice teacher training. AIR found two States actively involved in encouraging colleges and universities to include career education concepts and methods in their ongoing curricula for prospective teachers. This review uncovered four States that had initiated efforts in this area by the end of 1981 and another three that intend to make it a priority in the coming year. Only one of the eight States reports significant success to date. In that case several State colleges and universities offer career education courses on a regular basis.

Disbursements to LEAs: Sec. 8(a)(2)

There is one commonality in States' approaches to distributing the LEA portions of their CEIA allotments: all nine reviewed by AIR and all eight reviewed in the present study required grant applications from LEAs and/or other eligible agencies. In nearly all cases, awards were made on a competitive basis according to criteria established by the State. Otherwise, the eight States represent eight quite different strategies for maximizing the impact of LEA grants. Some of the differences are evident in Exhibit 9.

Grantees. "LEA" grantees fall generally into three categories: (1) single school districts (LEAs); (2) consortia of LEAs who band together to apply for CEIA grants, and; (3) intermediate educational agencies (IEAs). Direct grants to LEAs are used to defray a variety of expenses of local program installation or expansion; salaries for local career education coordinators (generally part-time), inservice training, and materials are usually the major costs. IEA grants are for providing coordination and supportive services to LEAs. These services include training and technical assistance, materials lending and distribution, curriculum development, and promotion of community collaboration. IEAs serve in much the same leadership capacities as SEAs, but on a regional level. Taking the IEA approach enables States to serve large numbers of LEAs but with less intensity and local discretion than the LEA approach affords. Midway on the LEA-IEA continuum is the consortium,

where resources are pooled and efforts are coordinated, but the governance of the CEIA grant program is clearly in the hands of the participating LEAs.

In FY 1980 and 1981 three of the eight States awarded all of their LEA allotments directly to LEAs, one reserved the entire LEA portion for six IEAs, one had a combination of LEAs and consortia, one had a combination of LEAs, consortia, and IEAs, and one awarded grants to a combination of LEAs, consortia, IEAs, and other agencies, including postsecondary institutions and private not-for-profit agencies. See Exhibit 9.

Size of grants. There are two competing philosophies concerning the size of LEA and consortium grants. Some States opt for small grant awards on the theory that this not only allows for large numbers of grants, but also prevents LEA dependency on outside funding and increases the likelihood of program continuation once grants expire. Other States concentrate their resources in a relatively small number of districts, reasoning that levels of assistance below a certain threshold are unlikely to have significant impact and/or that cultivating a few exemplary programs will lead to adoptions of the models in other LEAs.

Only one of the eight States reviewed here is firmly in the "large grant" category, making annual awards in the $30,000 range. Two States express firm "seed grant" convictions; most of their LEA grants are for less than $5,000 and both of these States also award "minigrants", limited to $300 in one State and $1,000 in the other. The other four States' grants average less

Exhibit 9

Summary of LEA Grants
P.L. 95-207

This table demonstrates variations in States' approaches to LEA grant-making in terms of the types and numbers of grants and the proportion of LEAs served.

		CA	TX	PA	FL	VA	CT	AZ	ID
Number of LEAs in state		1043	1102	505	69	141	109	223	115
Total amount of LEA grants (in thousands of dollars)	FY 80	1348	951	781	449	364	226	172	112
	FY 81	1032	724	556	296	255	164	137	124
Number of IEA grants	FY 80	19	16				6		
	FY 81	10	19				6		
Number of LEA & consortium grants	FY 80	92	42	~40	41	46		6	23
	FY 81	52	36	~40	35	35		5	33
States making consortium grants			x	x					
% LEAs served by IEA grants	FY 80	100	~80				100		
	FY 81	100	~95				100		
% LEAs served by LEA & consortium grants	FY 80	<9	21	15	62	33		3	20
	FY 81	<5	39	15	52	24		2	29

~ denotes approximations

California also awarded grants to postsecondary institutions and private agencies (18 in FY 1980, 15 in FY 1981) and some LEAs received more than one grant.

Texas and Pennsylvania made grants to both consortia and LEAs. Both States reported the number of LEAs served by these grants, but neither gave the number of grants of each type.

than $10,000 per LEA per year. In one of these States every applicant is awarded a grant, with the amount dependent on need and merit. In another, planning grants have been for $5,000 and implementation grants for $20,000, regardless of the size of the LEA.

AIR's sample of nine visited States was more inclined toward the "large grant" theory. LEA grants were awarded to an average of less than 10 percent of the LEAs in those States (as contrasted to about 25 percent in the present sample) in amounts averaging $44,000.

The "agency type" and "grant size" issues both revolve around the question, "In allocating modest resources toward a goal of instituting lasting change on a Statewide basis, which consideration is more important: intensity or breadth?" It is a question well worth answering, but is beyond the scope of this report.

Other observations of the eight States' LEA grant-making strategies are:

- Although all of the States encourage comprehensive programming, some fund only specific implementation activities (e.g., curriculum development) or program components (e.g., career guidance, handicapped students) in any given LEA. In some cases these special emphases are in the form of separate funding categories in the competitive grant process; in others they emerge from local needs assessments.

- Proposal review criteria and point assignments reflect States' priorities and implementation models. For example, one State called for proposals to implement and demonstrate all

sixteen elements of its career education model. Another called for proposals in each of eleven categories corresponding to its implementation model. Another State, whose long-range strategy for promoting and supporting career education is through collaboration with business and industry, gives this factor the greatest weight in evaluating proposals.

- Some States compensate for variations in districts' grant-writing capacities by putting LEAs into competition only with others of similar size.

- Most FY 1981 grants were continuations of FY 1980 grants, but some of the States intended to limit P.L. 95-207 funding to two or three years.

- With one exception, the States' response to reduced funding in FY 1981 was to reduce the number of grants from the number awarded in FY 1980. This appears in conflict with the philosophy behind the Incentive Act. However, the number of grants was not reduced proportionately in most cases (that is, awards were also reduced in size).

LEAS' Use of Funds: Sec. (8)(a)(3)

All eight States promote comprehensive career education programming. Their definitions of comprehensiveness vary somewhat, but share the following key points: (1) Career education concepts should be infused throughout the K-12 instructional curriculum (i.e., offered to all students and not solely through career education courses). (2) Guidance and counseling programs should emphasize career exploration and planning. (3) Career education should be a collaborative effort of the schools and the broader community. As discussed above, however, States' strategies in allocating P.L. 95-207 funds in pursuit of these goals vary.

In some States (typically the "large grant" ones), every funded LEA is expected to implement all or most of the thirteen activities listed in the Act as comprising a comprehensive program, and to use P.L. 95-207 funds to do so. In other cases funded programs are expected to be "comprehensive", but not all activities are supported with CEIA monies. In still other cases LEAs are not expected to operate comprehensive programs, even though they are generally expected to aim toward that goal.

Thus, we find that nearly all States conduct nearly all of the activities listed in Section 8(a)(3)(A through M) of the Act, but that few LEAs use P.L. 95-207 funds to carry out the entire set of activities.

As illustrated in Exhibit 10, AIR's study of nine States and the present study of eight both found 100 percent of the States

Exhibit 10

Use of LEA Funds

Columns 1 and 2 show the percentage of States using funds in at least one LEA. Column 3 shows the percentage of LEAs using funds for the purpose specified.

Study	Present	AIR	
LEA activity: Sect. 8(a)(3). . .	% States N=8	%States N=9	%LEAs N=24
(A) Incorporating CE into instruction	100%	100%	87%
(B) Career guidance	100	100	61
(C) Collaborative relationships	100	67	61
(D) Work experience programs	88	56	35
(E) Employing local CE coordinators	na	56	57
(F) Training local CE coordinators	na	78	26
(G) Inservice training	100	100	96
(H) Conducting community institutes	na	33	43
(I) Purchasing materials & supplies	100	100	91
(J) Community CE councils	100	56	39
(K) CE resource centers	100	89	70
(L) Local CE plans	100	78	48
(M) Needs assessments & evaluations	100	78	73

funding the following activities at the local level:

- Incorporating career education concepts into the instructional program.
- Developing and implementing comprehensive career guidance and counseling services.
- Providing inservice training for local personnel.
- Purchasing career education supplies and materials.

All of the States reviewed here and the majority visited by AIR also reported these LEA activities:

- Developing collaborative relationships with business, labor, industry, professional, and community organizations.
- Establishing and operating community career education councils.
- Establishing and operating career education resource centers.
- Adopting, reviewing, and revising local plans for career education.
- Conducting career education needs assessments and evaluations.

The remaining LEA activities authorized specifically by P.L. 95-207 could not be positively verified from annual reports and were found less common by AIR:

- Employing local career education coordinators.
- Training local career education coordinators.
- Conducting institutes for community leaders and parents regarding career education.

All eight States reviewed here had designated career education coordinators at the local level, but it is not clear to what extent their salaries are subsidized by P.L. 95-207 funds. Some States have policies prohibiting this. Training of local

career education coordinators typically is shown as a State leadership function, rather than a local expense. All States and most LEAs have engaged in community collaboration, whether or not they conduct institutes toward this end.

Exhibit 11 shows LEA expenditures reported by the States. Incorporating career education into instructional and guidance programs are by far the largest targets of Career Education Incentive Act funds.

Exhibit 11
LEAs' Use of Grants
P.L. 95-207

(As percentages of States' total outlays in FY 1980 and FY 1981 combined)

	CA	TX	PA	FL	VA	CT	AZ	ID	Avg.	AIR
Total LEA	88%	93%	86%	81%	88%	96%	98%	93%	90%	84%
Career Guidance	28	14	19	31	38	18	41	21	26	20
Needs/eval	8	5	1	2	2	9	3	1	4	2
CE in instruc.	20	51	32	35	19	37	28	54	35	50
Collaboration	16	6	1	2	14	3	3	1	6	4
Private schools	14	-	1	7	1	28	-	-	6	1
Other	6	16	34	5	14	-	23	16	14	8
Total SEA	12	7	14	19	12	4	2	7	10	16

AIR's data based on 26 FY 80 annual reports.
Totals may not add up due to rounding error.

Special Provisions of the Act

Section 8(c)(1) requires States to provide for equitable participation of private schools in the CEIA program. References to the Congressional intent to provide sex-fair and culture-fair career education appear throughout the Act. Section 6(10) requires that at least 15 percent of the States' allotments be used to support career guidance activities and section 6(3) requires State matching of CEIA grants.

Private schools. AIR located no State objectives concerning private schools in their review of 26 FY 1980 annual reports. No objectives were found for the eight States reviewed here, but five reported some expenditures and efforts in this category. Of those five States, four invited private schools to participate in State leadership functions, two encouraged applications for LEA grants, and two required public LEA grantees to offer services to private schools in their districts.

It appears that States generally regard services to private schools as a matter of compliance rather than a State priority.

Educational equity. The charge to overcome bias and stereotyping in career choice (particularly with regard to sex) has been taken more seriously. All eight States reported efforts in this area; in all but one their approaches appear quite comprehensive, involving a number of different strategies. They have included: conducting workshops and conferences on the topic (7 States), developing materials (3 States) and distributing information (7 States) about counteracting bias and stereotyping,

requiring LEA grant applications to address these issues (3 States), and screening materials for bias and sterotyping (at least 3 States; in two it is done by the vocational education sex equity specialist).

Career Guidance. AIR found an average of 20 percent of 26 States' allotments committed to career guidance; the eight States reviewed here reported 26 percent of their expenditures in this area. Both estimates are well above the 15 percent required by the Act. Most States require or encourage all LEA grantees to address career guidance, some reserve career guidance as a special funding category, and a few do both.

State Match. For every $100 of P.L. 95-207 funds spent, the required State contributions to activities addressing the goals of the State plan are as follows:

	FY 1979	FY 1980	FY 1981	FY 1982	FY 1983
State administration	-0-	$ 33	$100	$100	$100
State leadership & LEA grants	-0-	-0-	$ 33	$100	$300

The matching reported in FY 1980 and 1981 substantially exceeded these requirements, particularly considering that the reviewed reports deal primarily with FY 1979 and 1980 funds, when little was required, as detailed above.

The eight States reported a total match of nearly $45 million in State funds over the two years. However, one State included the entire State appropriation for a large program which supports elementary guidance and occupational specialists, as

well as career education per se. Using a conservative estimate of the portion of that program spent specifically on career education brings the total down to $11.3 million, or 124 percent of the eight States' combined allotments of $9.1 million for FY 1979 and 1980.

Unfortunately, this $11.3 million consists primarily of a one-time large-scale assessment effort and four rather generous programs of State funding, three of which have expired. As of August, 1982 only one of the eight States was designating its own funds specifically for career education beyond the costs of supporting SEA personnel.

AIR found seven of nine States appropriating FY 1979 funds to career education by name; the amounts ranged from $25,000 to $2.4 million.

Since wide variations are evident in the standards and methods used in estimating local contributions reported in the annual reports, an analysis of those data would not be meaningful. AIR estimated, on the basis of site visits to 24 LEAs receiving CEIA grants, that an average of only 38 percent of the costs of local career education efforts were supported by P.L. 95-207 funds, even though no matching requirements were yet in effect. Thirty-seven percent of the costs were supported by local funds and another 18 percent by other non-federal sources, for a total matching rate of 122 percent.

These findings indicate that, at least in the aggregate, the 100 percent matching requirements for FY 1982 were being met well ahead of schedule. Furthermore, local contributions were so

large that even a total withdrawal of State funds would not jeapordize States' ability to meet the requirements of the Act through 1982.

Besides P.L. 95-207, federal programs used to support career education activities at both the State and local levels have included CETA, Vocational Education, and ESEA Titles IV-C and V.

Ch. 5
STATE IMPACT

Without exception, the State Coordinators of Career Education interviewed in the conduct of this review consider the Career Education Incentive Act to have had substantial impact in their States. Several who have administered other federal programs expressed amazement at how much has been accomplished with so few dollars, noting that this is one case where the "seed money" theory has clearly worked, with local efforts extending far beyond the levels and duration of grant awards. Opportunities to conduct large scale staff development efforts, purchase essential materials, and expand career education's advocacy base within and beyond the educational community were cited as major benefits of the CEIA program.

With only one exception, the State Coordinators are not only proud of their States' accomplishments in career education, but optimistic about its future, in spite of limited prospects for special State or federal funding in the forseeable future. All States estimate that a majority of schools have made significant progress toward comprehensive career education programming; in some States the estimates are much higher. Furthermore, most of the States have achieved important accomplishments on the State level to assure the perpetration of the movement. These include:

- o Bringing career education to the attention of the public in general and policymakers in particular through mechanisms such as:
  - Influential State Commissions and Advisory Councils for Career Education, whose activities include sponsorship and financial support for career education efforts, as well as advocacy of the concept.
  - Legislative study committees and hearings on career education.
  - Expressions of support from Governors and other senior State officials, including proclamations of career education weeks, sponsorship of symposia, and appointments of special councils.
  - Ongoing state-wide assessment programs, including student testing and public opinion polling with regard to career education.
  - Periodic submissions of State status reports and plans for career education to State legislatures.
- o Integration of career education into State educational policy through mechanisms such as:
  - Mandates from State legislatures and departments of education to include career education in local curricula.
  - Incorporation of career education into State goals for education.
  - Incorporation of career education into State accreditation standards.
  - Incorporation of career education into State-supported school assessment and planning programs.
  - Infusion of career education into State-approved K-12 instructional and guidance curricula.
  - Establishment of infused career education content as a criterion for State textbook adoption.
  - Cooperative arrangements with other State programs and agencies for adult education, vocational education, migrant education, and employment and training.

Incorporating career education into the teacher preparation curricula of colleges and universities and developing cadres of

career education practitioners to provide training and technical assistance are other measures taken by States to strengthen their capacities to maintain the career education effort. To a large extent, State Coordinators attribute the formulation and execution of these strategies to State leadership functions and LEA incentives made possible by the CEIA.

Ch. 6

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

CEIA monies have been allotted and matched as prescribed in the Act.

- 6.5 percent of the annual appropriation has been reserved at the federal level for model programs, information dissemination, and evaluation. The remaining 93.5 percent has been allotted to States and insular areas.
- The portion of State allotments passed on to LEAs has been more than the required 80 percent in FY 1979 and 85 percent thereafter. One estimate of the LEA pass-through is 84 percent; the other is over 90 percent. Both of these estimates deal primarily with FY 1979 funds.
- The States have spent more on leadership than on administration.
- State matching requirements have been met. As early as 1980 the average local match was estimated at 122 percent and the State match at an additional 124 percent. Local contributions were so large that even a total withdrawal of State funds would not jeapordize States' ability to comply with the 100 percent matching requirements that went into effect in FY 1981 for State administration and in FY 1982 for State leadership and LEA grants.

The Division of Career Education has assumed a national leadership role in career education as well as an administrative one, in accordance with the Congressional intent.

- The Division's major emphases have been (1) to promote collaboration with the business/labor/industry community and with civic and community organizations and (2) to encourage adoptions of and additions to the 28 career education programs already approved by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel.

- The Division of Career Education has maintained extensive communications with the career education community and collaborating organizations through career education monographs, speeches, memoranda, conferences, and technical assistance services.

The Career Education Incentive Act has strengthened the SEA role of State leadership in career education.

- CEIA funds have supported a variety of State efforts in training, collaboration, evaluation, and materials development and distribution.

- The promotion of educational equity in career education programming has been a strength in State leadership.

- Incorporating career education into teacher training institutions' ongoing preservice curricula is an area where relatively little success has been achieved and is sorely needed.

In distributing LEA grants, some States have opted for intensity by concentrating resources in a small number of LEAs while others have favored breadth by awarding large numbers of small grants.

- The number of LEAs served by the LEA portion of State allotments has varied from 2 percent to 100 percent.

- Some States have used the LEA portion to fund intermediate education agencies to provide training, technical assistance, and other support services to large numbers of LEAs. Other States have encouraged LEAs to form consortia, where CEIA resources are pooled and efforts are coordinated, but the governance of the CEIA grant is clearly in the hands of participating LEAs. In other States LEA grants have been made to single school districts. States have also combined these three types of grants in various ways.

- One philosophy concerning the size of LEA grants is to keep them small (usually in the $5,000 range) to prevent dependency on outside funding. Another is to make them large enough (usually $30,000 or more) to assure an impact. Which approach is more effective in promoting innovation on a Statewide basis has not been determined.

- All of the States reviewed promote a comprehensive approach to career education programming and most of them have funded all of the 13 LEA activities authorized by the Act. However, CEIA funds rarely support all 13 activities in a given LEA.

The CEIA has created a widespread awareness of and involvement ment in career education within the elementary and secondary education community.

- In most States the majority of LEAs have been reached through a combination of State leadership activities and LEA grants. In some States all LEAs have been served.
- All of the eight States estimate that a majority of schools have made significant progress toward comprehensive career education programming; in some States the estimate is over 90 percent.
- State Career Education Coordinators report that the CEIA program is one case where "seed grants" have clearly worked, with local efforts extending far beyond the levels and duration of grant awards.

The CEIA has created widespread awareness of and involvement in career education among the business/labor/industry community and civic and community organizations.

- Sixteen organizations have formulated national action plans for career education as a result of the Division of Career Education's leadership efforts. Forty-five States have in turn made plans to coordinate with these organizations.
- Eight States reported collaborative efforts with a total of 86 different agencies and organizations.

The CEIA has strengthened States' capacities to promote career education on an ongoing basis.

- In many States career education has been brought to the attention of the public in general and policymakers in particular through mechanisms such as legislative study committees, statewide assessment programs, and demonstrations of support from Governors and other senior officials.

- Career education has been established as State educational policy in some States through legislative actions and the inclusion of career education in State goals for education, accreditation standards, school improvement initiatives, and State-approved curricula and texts.

- Working with other State agencies and developing cadres of career education experts are among the other methods employed by SEAs to expand career education's advocacy base and to integrate career education throughout the education system and into employment, training, and human services programs.

In spite of its relatively small size and short duration, it appears that the Career Education Incentive Act has achieved its purpose of advancing the career education movement from the research and development stage well into nationwide implementation. Furthermore, the integration of career education into States' policies and programs gives reason to believe that the impact will endure.

The CEIA program's success in promoting career education at the local, State, and national levels demonstrates the feasibility of combining federal leadership and support for innovation with recognition that education is ultimately a State and local responsibility. Particular features of the Act which seem to have contributed to its impact include: wide discretion in SEAs' and LEAs' use of funds, minimum reporting requirements, declining federal support combined with increasing matching requirements, and provision for leadership at both the State and national levels.

REFERENCES

American Institutes for Research (Jung, S.M. & Steel, L.) Rapid feedback evaluation of the career education incentive act program: Phase II technical report. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research, 1981.

Bhaerman, R.D. Career education and basic academic achievement: A descriptive analysis of the research. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1977. (ERIC No. ED 140 032)

Bonnet, D.G. What does career education do for kids?: A synthesis of 1975-76 evaluation results. Crawfordsville, IN: New Educational Directions, Inc., 1977. (ERIC No. ED 143 831)

Datta, L.E., Artberbury, E.H., Rapley, F., Spieth, P.E., Ruff, R.D., & High, S.C., Jr. Career education: What proof do we have that it works? Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1976. (ERIC No. ED 151 516)

Development Associates, Inc. An evaluation of vocational exemplary projects: Executive summary and final report. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1975. (ERIC No. ED 109 475)

Enderlein, T.E. A review of career education evaluation studies. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1976. (ERIC No. ED 141 584)

Herr, E.L. The emerging history of career education: A summary view. Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council for Career Education, 1975. (ERIC No. ED 122 011)

Herr, E.L. Research in career education: The state of the art. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1977. (ERIC No. ED 149 177)

High, S.C., Jr. Career education: A national overview. School Science and Mathematics Journal, 1976, 76(4), 276-284.

Hoyt, K.B. Community resources for career education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1976. (ERIC No. ED 130 118)

Hoyt, K.B. Career education: A report card for the 70's and some predictions for the decade of the 1980's. Journal of Career Education, 1980, 7(2), 82-96.

McLaughlin, D.M. Career education in the public schools, 1974-75: A national survey. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1976. (ERIC No. 170 539)

National Advisory Council for Career Education. The efficacy of career education. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1976. (ERIC No. ED 130 092)

Senate Committee on Human Resources. Career Education Incentive Act. Report No. 95-498. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Senate, 1977.

Tuckman, B.W. & Carducci, J.A. Evaluating career education: A review and model. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1974. (ERIC No. 102 212)

U.S. Office of Education. An introduction to career education: A policy paper. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975. (ERIC No. ED 130 076)

APPENDICES

A: State Allotments

B: The Career Education Incentive Act

APPENDIX A

Career Education Funds Distributed to the States Pursuant to Section 3(a)(1) of Pub. L. 95-207
Fiscal Year 1979 through 1982

	FISCAL YEAR			
STATE	1979	1980	1981	1982
ALABAMA	305,706	224,866	134,194	127,674
ALASKA	125,276	128,472	125,250	125,000
ARIZONA	189,030	141,179	126,264	125,000
ARKANSAS	171,756	128,472	126,127	125,000
CALIFORNIA	1,682,038	1,237,131	738,282	693,835
COLORADO	210,865	156,703	126,403	125,000
CONNECTICUT	245,412	176,836	126,584	125,000
DELAWARE	125,341	128,472	125,308	125,000
FLORIDA	599,029	443,912	264,913	264,538
GEORGIA	422,710	310,496	185,294	181,534
HAWAII	125,518	128,472	125,478	125,000
IDAHO	125,513	128,472	125,482	125,000
ILLINOIS	907,341	659,560	393,605	354,332
INDIANA	443,567	324,566	193,690	177,221
IOWA	234,658	170,287	126,525	125,000
KANSAS	178,274	130,020	126,156	125,000
KENTUCKY	281,914	206,431	126,848	125,000
LOUISIANA	348,726	255,916	152,723	143,051
MAINE	125,636	128,472	125,584	125,000
MARYLAND	340,905	245,971	146,788	132,162
MASSACHUSETTS	456,278	328,689	196,151	171,744
MICHIGAN	777,628	565,199	337,293	304,595
MINNESOTA	333,735	241,846	144,327	128,301
MISSISSIPPI	212,170	156,703	126,403	125,000
MISSOURI	377,407	275,080	164,159	149,589
MONTANA	125,455	128,472	125,421	125,000
NEBRASKA	125,889	128,472	125,815	125,000
NEVADA	125,369	-0-	-0-	-0-
NEW HAMPSHIRE	125,497	128,472	125,463	125,000
NEW JERSEY	581,755	419,412	250,292	224,776
NEW MEXICO	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
NEW YORK	1,389,694	998,922	596,126	524,734
NORTH CAROLINA	445,220	324,982	195,138	185,757
NORTH DAKOTA	125,388	128,472	125,352	125,000
OHIO	873,447	635,303	379,129	340,377

APPENDIX A - Con't

Career Education Funds Distributed to the States Pursuant to Section 5(a)(1) of Pub. L. 95-207
Fiscal Year 1979 through 1982

(Continued)	FISCAL YEAR			
STATE	1979	1980	1981	1982
OKLAHOMA	216,080	158,644	126,421	125,000
OREGON	182,185	135,356	126,212	125,000
PENNSYLVANIA	906,038	654,224	390,420	351,811
RHODE ISLAND	125,522	128,472	125,474	125,000
SOUTH CAROLINA	244,434	179,991	126,612	125,000
SOUTH DAKOTA	125,406	-0-	-0-	-0-
TENNESSEE	339,601	250,379	149,338	143,775
TEXAS	1,058,241	784,244	468,013	462,744
UTAH	125,806	128,472	125,765	125,000
VERMONT	125,288	128,472	125,265	125,000
VIRGINIA	408,695	299,822	178,925	164,889
WASHINGTON	292,344	216,619	129,272	125,000
WEST VIRGINIA	143,728	128,472	125,945	125,000
WISCONSIN	388,162	281,143	167,779	149,923
WYOMING	125,237	128,472	125,224	125,000
DISTRICT OF COLU.	125,358	128,472	125,324	125,000
PUERTO RICO	304,729	226,807	135,352	127,422
TOTAL	18,500,000	13,875,000	9,364,114	8,880,000 /1
INSULAR AREAS				
AMERICAN SAMOA	28,374	26,206	11,687	9,478
GUAM	62,009	69,521	31,005	25,730
NORTHERN MARIANA	8,629	9,674	4,314	4,469
TRUST TERRITORY	66,207	-0-	33,104	29,704
VIRGIN ISLANDS	39,781	44,599	19,890	26,619
TOTAL	200,000	150,000	100,000	96,000

/1 May not total exactly due to rounding

APPENDIX B

PUBLIC LAW 95-207—DEC. 13, 1977

CAREER EDUCATION INCENTIVE ACT

39-139 O - 77 (111)

uls to the concept of career education by institutions of higher education located in the State;

(3) making payments to local educational agencies for comprehensive programs including—

(A) instilling career education concepts and approaches in the classroom;

(B) developing and implementing comprehensive career guidance, counseling, placement, and followup services utilizing counselors, teachers, parents, and community resource personnel;

(C) developing and implementing collaborative relationships with organizations representing the handicapped, minority groups, and women and with all other elements of the community, including the use of personnel from such organizations and the community as resource persons in schools and for student field trips into that community;

(D) developing and implementing work experiences for students whose primary purpose is career exploration, if such work experiences are related to existing or potential career opportunities and do not displace other workers who perform such work;

(E) employing coordinators of career education in local educational agencies or in combinations of such agencies (but not the individual school building level);

(F) training of local career education coordinators;

(G) providing inservice education for educational personnel, especially teachers, counselors, and school administrators, designed to help such personnel to understand career education, to acquire competencies in the field of career education and to acquaint such personnel with the changing work patterns of men and women, ways of overcoming sex stereotyping in career education, and ways of assisting women and men to broaden their career horizons;

(H) conducting institutes for members of boards of local educational agencies, community leaders, and parents concerning the nature and goals of career education;

(I) purchasing instructional materials and supplies for career education activities;

(J) establishing and operating community career education councils;

(K) establishing and operating career education resource centers serving both students and the general public;

(L) adopting, reviewing, and revising local plans for coordinating the implementation of the comprehensive program; and

(M) conducting needs assessments and evaluations; and

(4) reviewing and revising the State plan.

(b) The State shall make payments to local educational agencies for the purposes described in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) from funds received under this Act upon applications approved by the State educational agency. Such payments shall, to the extent practicable, be made on an equitable basis in accordance with criteria established by the State educational agency, consistent with section 6(9), having due regard for the special needs of local educational agencies

STATE PLANS

Contents.
20 USC 2606.

SEC. 7. Every State desiring to receive funds appropriated pursuant to section 4 shall submit to the Commissioner by July 1, 1979, a State plan which shall—

(1) set out explicitly the objectives the State will seek to achieve by the end of each of the fiscal years for which funds are made available under this Act in implementing the goal of providing career education for students in elementary and secondary schools within the State, with special emphasis on overcoming sex bias and stereotyping, and set out the methods by which the State will seek each year to achieve such objectives with all resources available;

(2) describe the methods by which the funds received under this Act will be used, in accordance with section 8, to implement the overall objectives in each of the fiscal years for which funds are made available under this Act;

(3) set forth policies and procedures which the State will follow to assure equal access of all students (including the handicapped and members of both sexes) to career education programs carried out under the State plan;

(4) provide adequate assurance that the requirements of section 6 will be met in each fiscal year after fiscal year 1979; and

(5) provide proposed criteria to the Commissioner for the evaluation of the extent to which the State will achieve the objectives set out in the State plan.

USE OF FUNDS

Federal share payments.
20 USC 2607.

SEC. 8. (a) Subject to the provisions of sections 9(b) and 10, funds received under this Act may be used only to pay the Federal share of the total costs of—

(1) employing such additional State educational agency personnel as may be required for the administration and coordination of programs assisted under this Act;

(2) providing State leadership for career education, either directly or through arrangements with public agencies and private organizations (including institutions of higher education), in—

(A) conducting inservice institutes for educational personnel;

(B) training local career education coordinators;

(C) collecting, evaluating, and disseminating career education materials on an intrastate and interstate basis with special emphasis on overcoming sex bias and stereotyping;

(D) conducting statewide needs assessment and evaluation studies;

(E) conducting statewide career education leadership conferences;

(F) engaging in collaborative relationships with other agencies of State government and with public agencies and private organizations representing business, labor, industry and the professions and organizations representing the handicapped, minority groups, women, and older Americans; and

(G) promoting the adaptation of teacher-training curric-

unless such funds are appropriated in the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year in which such funds will be obligated, and unless such funds are made available for expenditure to the States prior to the beginning of such fiscal year.

ALLOTMENT

SEC. 5. (a)(1) From the funds appropriated pursuant to section 4 for each fiscal year which are not reserved under paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such funds as such State's population aged five to eighteen, inclusive, bears to the total population, aged five to eighteen, inclusive, of all the States, except that no State shall be allotted from such funds for each fiscal year an amount less than $125,000. State allotments. 20 USC 2604.

(2) From the remainder of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 4 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner may reserve— Reserves.

(A) an amount not to exceed 5 per centum each year for the administration of this Act and for making model program grants pursuant to section 10,

(B) an amount not to exceed 1 per centum each year for the purpose of carrying out the information program pursuant to section 12 of this Act,

(C) an amount not to exceed one-half of one per centum each year for the purpose of carrying out a national evaluation of the effectiveness of programs assisted under this Act in carrying out the purposes of this Act, and

(D) an amount equal to 1 per centum for the purpose of making payments to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

(b)(1) Any funds allotted to a State under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) for which a State has not applied or for which a State application has not been approved shall be reallotted by ratably increasing the allocations of each of the States which have approved applications. Reallotment.

(2) If the sums appropriated for any fiscal year are not sufficient to make the allotments of the minimum amounts specified in paragraph (1) of subsection (a), such minimum amounts shall be ratably reduced. If additional sums become available during a fiscal year for which such allotments were reduced, such allotments shall be increased on the same basis as they were reduced.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, any State which receives, in any fiscal year, the minimum allotment prescribed under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section does not have to comply with the provisions of section 6(6) relating to staff employed at the State level.

APPLICATIONS

SEC. 6. Every State desiring to receive funds appropriated under section 4 for fiscal year 1979 shall submit to the Commissioner an application containing assurances that— Contents. 20 USC 2605.

(1) the State educational agency will be the agency responsible for planning the use, and administering the expenditure, of funds received under this Act, other than funds made available under sections 10, 11, and 12;

(2) the State legislature and the Governor have been notified of the State's application for such funds;

(3)(A) the State will expend, from its own sources, for any fiscal year for which funds are received under this Act, an amount equal to or exceeding the amount which such State expended for career education during the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made;

Non-Federal share costs, payment.

(B) the State will pay from non-Federal sources the non-Federal share of the costs of carrying out the State plan for fiscal year 1980 and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years;

(4) the State will make every possible effort to integrate career education into the regular education programs offered in elementary and secondary schools in the State;

(5)(A) the State educational agency will require that programs of career education assisted under this Act will be administered by State and local educational agencies in such a manner as to affect all instructional programs in elementary and secondary education, and will not be administered solely as a part of the vocational education program;

(B) the State educational agency will require that programs of career education will be coordinated by an individual having prior experience in the field of career education (who shall be designated as a State coordinator of career education);

(6) such agency will employ such staff as are necessary to provide for the administration of this Act and programs of career education funded under this Act, including a person or persons experienced with respect to problems of discrimination in the labor market and stereotyping affecting career education, including bias and stereotyping on account of race, sex, age, economic status, or handicap, and including at least one professional trained in guidance and counseling who shall work jointly in the office of the principal staff person responsible for such administration and coordination and in the office of the State educational agency responsible for guidance and counseling, if any such office exists;

Review.

(7) such agency will continuously review the plan submitted under section 7 and will submit such amendments thereto as may be deemed appropriate in response to such agency's experience with the program;

(8) the State educational agency will comply with the provisions of section 9(b) with respect to the distribution of funds to local educational agencies within the State;

(9) the State educational agency will not allocate payments under this Act among local educational agencies within the State on the basis of per capita enrollment or through matching of local expenditures on a uniform percentage basis, or deny funds to any local educational agency if the applicable jurisdiction in which such agency is located is making a reasonable tax effort solely because such agency is unable to pay the non-Federal share of the costs of programs assisted under this Act;

(10) not less than 15 per centum of that portion of a State's grant for any fiscal year which is not reserved pursuant to section 9(b) will be used for programs described in section 3(a)(3)(B); and

(11) the funds received under this Act will be used in accordance with the provisions of section 8.

career education coordinators and staff described in paragraph (1) of section 8(a), the Federal share of the payments made under this Act from a State's allocment shall be not more than 100 per centum for the fiscal year 1979, not more than 75 per centum for the fiscal year 1980 and not more than 50 per centum for the fiscal years 1981, 1982, and 1983.

(2) For the purposes described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 8(a), the Federal share of the payments made under this Act from a State's allocment shall be not more than 100 per centum for the fiscal years 1979 and 1980, not more than 75 per centum for the fiscal year 1981, not more than 50 per centum for the fiscal year 1982, and not more than 25 per centum for the fiscal year 1983.

Waiver.

(d)(1) If a State is prohibited by law from providing for the participation in programs of children enrolled in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools, as required by section 8(c), the Commissioner may waive such requirement and shall arrange for the provision of services to such children through arrangements which shall be subject to the requirements of that section.

Waiver.

(2) If the Commissioner determines that a State or a local educational agency has substantially failed to provide for the participation on an equitable basis of children enrolled in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools as required by section 8(c), the Commissioner may waive such requirement and shall arrange for the provision of services to such children through arrangements which shall be subject to the requirements of that section.

MODEL PROGRAMS

Grants.
20 USC 2609.

SEC. 10. (a) From funds reserved under section 5(a)(2)(A) of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants directly to State and local educational agencies, institutions of postsecondary education, and other nonprofit agencies and organizations to support projects, including projects of proven effectiveness, to demonstrate the most effective methods and techniques in career education and to develop exemplary career education models particularly projects designed to eliminate bias and stereotyping on account of race, sex, age, economic status, or handicap.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be made available under the provisions of section 406(f)(1) of the Education Amendments of 1974 for grants or contracts with local educational agencies for any fiscal year in which funds are appropriated under this Act and reserved for the purposes of this section under section 5(a)(2)(A).

20 USC 1945.

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

20 USC 2610.

SEC. 11. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to arrange by way of grant, contract, or other arrangement with institutions of higher education, public agencies and nonprofit private organizations for the conduct of postsecondary educational career demonstration projects which—

(1) may have national significance or be of special value in promoting the field of career education in postsecondary educational programs,

(2) have unusual promise of promoting postsecondary career guidance and counseling programs, particularly postsecondary guidance and counseling programs designed to overcome bias and stereotyping on account of race, sex, age, economic status, or handicap, or

(3) show promise of strengthening career guidance, counseling, placement, and followup services.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve arrangements under subsection (a) of this section if he finds— Approval.

(1) that the funds for which assistance is sought will be used for one of the purposes set forth in subsection (a) of this section, and

(2) that effective procedures, including objective measurements, will be adopted for evaluating at least annually the effectiveness of the project.

(c) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section there is authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year 1979 and for each fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1983. Appropriation authorization.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be made available under the provisions of section 406(f)(1) of the Education Amendments of 1974 for grants or contracts with institutions of higher education for any fiscal year in which funds are appropriated pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. 20 USC 1868.

CAREER EDUCATION INFORMATION

SEC. 12. (a) In consultation with members of the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, the Commissioner shall examine the occupational information needs of individuals and organizations eligible for participation in programs assisted by this Act. The examination shall consider the present activities of the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, the State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees, and other occupational information activities of the Office of Education, the National Institute of Education, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Employment and Training Administration, and such other Federal agencies as the Commissioner deems appropriate. Upon the conclusion of the examination, the Commissioner shall, either directly or by way of grant, contract or other arrangement, furnish information to interested parties on Federal programs which gather, analyze and disseminate occupational and career information. Examination. 20 USC 2611.

(b) The Commissioner shall, either directly or by way of grant, contract or other arrangement, disseminate information to interested parties on exemplary career education programs, including but not limited to programs assisted under this Act. Dissemination.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 13. (a)(1) The Office of Career Education created pursuant to section 406 of the Education Amendments of 1974 shall be the administering agency within the Office of Education for the review of the State plans, applications, and reports submitted pursuant to this Act. In addition, the Office of Career Education shall perform a national leadership role in furthering the purposes of this Act. 20 USC 2612.

Technical assistance.

(5) The Office of Career Education shall, upon request, provide technical assistance to all participating State educational agencies and to Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Ante.

(b) The National Advisory Council on Career Education created pursuant to section 406 of the Education Amendments of 1974 shall perform the same functions with respect to the programs authorized under this Act as the Council is authorized to perform with respect to the programs authorized under that section.

Cooperation between the Office of Education and Institute.

(c) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit the National Institute of Education from continuing to carry out its functions in the field of career education. The Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Education shall assure such cooperation as the Assistant Secretary deems appropriate between the Office of Education and the Institute to identify research and development priorities and, either directly or through arrangements with public agencies and private organizations (including institutions of higher education), to disseminate the results of the research and development undertaken by the Institute.

Staff and resources.

(d) The Office of Education shall provide the Office of Career Education and the National Advisory Council on Career Education with sufficient staff and resources required to carry out their responsibilities under this Act and under section 406 of the Education Amendments of 1974.

20 USC 1965.

(e) Section 406(g)(1)(B) of the Education Amendments of 1974 is amended to read as follows:

"(B) not less than fifteen public members broadly representative of the fields of education, guidance, and counseling, the arts, the humanities, the sciences, community services, business and industry, and the general public, including (i) members of organizations of handicapped persons, minority groups knowledgeable with respect to discrimination in employment and stereotyping affecting career choices, and women who are knowledgeable with respect to sex discrimination and stereotyping, and (ii) not less than two members who shall be representative of labor and of business, respectively.".

REPORTS

20 USC 2613.

SEC. 14. (a) Unless the Commissioner finds the requirements of this subsection unnecessary, not later than December 31 of each fiscal year each State receiving funds under this Act shall submit to the Commissioner a report evaluating the programs assisted with funds provided under this Act for the preceding fiscal year. Such report shall include—

Contents.

(1) an analysis of the extent to which the objectives set out in the State plan submitted pursuant to section 6 have been fulfilled during that preceding fiscal year;

(2) a description of the extent to which the State and local educational agencies within the State are using State and local resources to implement these objectives and a description of the extent to which funds received under this Act have been used to achieve these objectives; and

(3) a description of the exemplary programs funded within the State, including an analysis of the reasons for their success, and a description of the programs which were not successful within the State, including an analysis of the reasons for their failure.

Analysis and recommendations.

(b) The Commissioner, through the Office of Career Education, shall analyze each one of the State reports submitted pursuant to subsection (a) and shall provide to the State no later than three months after the date of such submission an analysis of the report and recommendations for improvement in the operation and administration of programs being provided by the State with funds made available under this Act.

Review report to congressional committees.

(c) The Commissioner shall conduct a comprehensive review of a random sample of the State programs funded under this Act and shall submit a report on such review to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Human Resources of the Senate by no later than September 30, 1982.

DEFINITIONS

20 USC 2514.

SEC. 15. For purposes of this Act the term—

(1)(A) "career education", for the purposes of this Act, except for paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3(a), and sections 8(b), 8(c), 9, 10, and 11, means the totality of experiences, which are designed to be free of bias and stereotyping (including bias or stereotyping on account of race, sex, age, economic status, or handicap), through which one learns about, and prepares to engage in, work as part of his or her way of living, and through which he or she relates work values to other life roles and choices (such as family life);

(B) "career education", for purposes of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3(a), and sections 8(b), 8(c), 9, 10, and 11, shall be limited to activities involving career awareness, exploration, decisionmaking, and planning, which activities are free of or are designed to eliminate bias and stereotyping (including bias or stereotyping on account of race, sex, age, economic status, or handicap), and shall not include any activities carried out by such agencies involving specific job skill training;

(2) "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education;

(3) "handicapped" means mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, or other health impaired persons, or persons with specific learning disabilities who by reason thereof require special education and related services;

(4) "local educational agency" has the meaning given such term by section 801(f) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

20 USC 881.

(5) "State" means the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

(6) "State educational agency" has the meaning given such term by section 801(k) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

AMENDMENT TO THE EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1978

20 USC 2302.

SEC. 16. Section 332 of the Education Amendments of 1978 is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2), by striking out "3 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "1 per centum", and by striking out "the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."; and

(2) in subsection (b)(3)(B), by striking out "and the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof ", the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico".

Approved December 13, 1977.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 95-150 (Comm. on Education and Labor) and No. 95-816 (Comm. of Conference).

SENATE REPORTS: No. 95-496 accompanying S. 1328 and 95-513 (both from Comm. on Human Resources).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 123 (1977):

Apr. 5, considered and passed House.

Oct. 20, considered and passed Senate, amended, in lieu of S. 1328.

Nov. 22, Senate agreed to conference report.

Nov. 29, House agreed to conference report.

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS, Vol. 13, No. 51:

Dec. 13, Presidential statement.